

21. The system according to claim 18, further comprising a light source which directs light through the ATR tunnel flow cell to the ultraviolet spectrometer.

22. The system according to claim 15, further comprising a light source which directs light through the ATR tunnel flow cell to the ultraviolet spectrometer.

23. The system according to claim 18, wherein said kraft liquor stream flowing through the ATR tunnel flow cell is not subjected to dilution.

24. The system according to claim 15, wherein said kraft liquor stream flowing through the ATR tunnel flow cell is not subjected to dilution.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended, and in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner states that these claims lack the structural cooperative relationship between the ultraviolet spectrometer and the device capable of providing ultraviolet absorption data. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described in the enclosed declaration of Dr. Chai, the spectrometer may send data to the device via air or by using an optical fiber capable of transmitting light. Thus, contrary to the position taken by the Examiner, no additional cooperative structure needs to be specified and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) Over Danielsson

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 11-13, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Danielsson. Claims 3, 14-15, and 18 stand rejected under 35

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com